



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,358	08/21/2001	Olivier Civelli	90,1092-BBB	7934

20306 7590 03/04/2004

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3200
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

ULM, JOHN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/934,358

Applicant(s)

CIVELLI ET AL.

Examiner

John D. Ulm

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/03/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

1) Claims 1 to 4 and 20 to 23 are pending in the instant application. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 20 to 23 have been added as requested by Applicant in the correspondence filed 28 October of 2003.

2) A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 28 October of 2003 has been entered.

3) Any objection or rejection of record that is not expressly repeated in this action has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.

4) The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5) Claims 20 to 23 are allowable as currently written.

6) Claims 1 to 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by the Wouters et al. publication (Biochem. Pharm. 33(24):4039-4044, 1984) for those reasons of record in section 9 of Paper Number 8. Applicant traverses this rejection on the premise that the limitation "obtained from a cell that expresses an exogenous gene encoding" the receptor recited therein distinguishes that claimed membrane preparation from the microsomal fraction of the Wouters et al. Because the presence of a recombinant gene in a host cell does not inherently alter the composition of the membrane of that cell then this is simply a process limitation that does not further

limit the claimed product. See M.P.E.P. 2113 and *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ2d 1922 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989) (The prior art disclosed human nerve growth factor (b-NGF) isolated from human placental tissue. The claim was directed to b-NGF produced through genetic engineering techniques. The factor produced seemed to be substantially the same whether isolated from tissue or produced through genetic engineering. While the applicant questioned the purity of the prior art factor, no concrete evidence of an unobvious difference was presented. The Board stated that the dispositive issue is whether the claimed factor exhibits any unexpected properties compared with the factor disclosed by the prior art. The Board further stated that the applicant should have made some comparison between the two factors to establish unexpected properties since the materials appeared to be identical or only slightly different.).

Applicant urges that there is no evidence that the microsomal preparation of Wouters et al. contains a D2 dopamine receptor comprising an amino acid sequence of the instant claims. Applicant is advise that one of the membrane preparations of Wouters et al. was prepared from rat "striata". Inherency is a question of fact. It is a matter of fact that mammalian striatum contains both D1 and D2 dopamine receptors. This assertion of fact is support by the initial statement in the "DISCUSSION" section of Wouters et al., which states that "D₂-Dopamine receptors were solubilized from dog, rat and human brain using a mixture of cholate and salt". There is no evidence of record that supports a conclusion that D2 dopamine receptors are not present in rat striatum. Further, there is no evidence of record that rats contain more than one species of D2

dopamine receptor in their striatum. The text on page 13 of the instant specification states that "a cDNA encoding the rat D₂ dopamine receptor was identified and isolated". Because Wouters et al. expressly stated that the preparation described therein contained rat D₂ dopamine receptors and Applicant has claimed to have isolated a cDNA encoding "the" rat D₂ dopamine receptor one would have to conclude that Applicant's cDNA encodes the D₂ dopamine receptors described by Wouters et al., in the absence of evidence to the contrary. In the absence of evidence that a rat D₂ dopamine receptor of the instant invention is not expressed in striatum, the evidence of record supports the conclusion that the instant claims are anticipated by the Wouters et al. publication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John D. Ulm whose telephone number is (571) 272-0880. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1646

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JOHN ULM
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800